

# **MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**



## **Local Pilot Project Business Practices Analysis Phase I Report**

**December 6, 2001**

---



## Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary .....	1-1
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.2	Summary .....	1-2
2	Project Methodology .....	2-1
3	Issue Identification .....	3-1
3.1	MANS Numbers .....	3-1
3.2	Arrest and Fingerprint Data .....	3-1
3.3	Prosecutor Data .....	3-3
3.4	Court Data .....	3-3
3.5	Corrections Data .....	3-4
4	Interview Findings.....	4-1
4.1	Findings at the State Level.....	4-1
4.1.1	CJIS Central Repository .....	4-1
4.1.2	Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Bureau.....	4-2
4.2	Criminal History Cycle at the Local Level .....	4-3
4.2.1	Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena .....	4-3
4.2.2	Glacier County/City of Cut Bank .....	4-4
4.3	Processing of the MANS Number .....	4-5
4.3.1	Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena .....	4-5
4.3.1.1	Arrest/Booking.....	4-5
4.3.1.2	Prosecutor Charges .....	4-6
4.3.1.3	Court Action.....	4-6
4.3.2	Glacier County/City of Cut Bank .....	4-8
4.3.2.1	Arrest/Booking.....	4-8
4.3.2.2	Prosecutor Charges .....	4-9
4.3.2.3	Court Action.....	4-9
4.4	Identification of Gaps and Inconsistencies .....	4-10
4.4.1	Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena .....	4-10
4.4.2	Glacier County/City of Cut Bank .....	4-11
4.5	General Observations.....	4-12
4.5.1	Intra-Agency Interaction.....	4-12
4.5.2	Data Submissions and Data Links .....	4-13
4.5.3	Data Systems and Data Transfer.....	4-14
4.5.4	Business Rules Versus Informal Procedures .....	4-15
5	Administrative Recommendations .....	5-1
5.1	Monitoring Local Activities.....	5-1
5.2	State-Level Actions.....	5-2
6	Next Steps.....	6-1
7	Appendix A: Interview Minutes with State Agencies.....	7-1
8	Appendix B: Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena View Table .....	8-1
9	Appendix C: Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena Interview Minutes.....	9-1
10	Appendix D: Glacier County/City of Cut Bank View Table .....	10-1



11	Appendix E: Glacier County/City of Cut Bank Interview Minutes .....	11-1
12	Appendix F: Sample Documents.....	12-1
13	Appendix G: CHRS Summary Data on MANS Number Requests and Fingerprint Submissions.....	13-1



# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This document is the project report for the Montana Department of Justice (MTDOJ) Local Pilot Project Business Practices Analysis (“Analysis”). This project reviewed current issues and activities related to the flow of criminal justice information among local criminal justice agencies at both the local and state levels. The focus of the project is on data that is reported to the state’s central repository, which is maintained by the MTDOJ Criminal Justice Information Services Bureau (CJIS Bureau).

This Analysis will form the basis of a second phase of the pilot project that will analyze possible technical solutions. A proposed work plan has been developed for the second phase and has been submitted as a separate document.

The Analysis is based on information gathered during interviews of state and local criminal justice agencies. MTDOJ selected two counties – Lewis & Clark County, including the City of Helena; and Glacier County, including the City of Cut Bank – to be part of the Analysis. Interviews were conducted on October 22 through October 29, 2001. Follow-up telephone inquiries were also made to clarify information provided in the earlier interviews.

This document contains the following sections:

Section 1, Executive Summary: This section introduces the purpose of the document and provides a brief summary of findings.

Section 2, Project Methodology: This section describes the methodology used to conduct the analysis.

Section 3, Issue Identification: This section lists the issues identified at the outset of the analysis that result in gaps in criminal history data at the central repository.

Section 4, Interview Findings: This section describes the information compiled during the interviews of state and local agencies.

Section 5, Administrative Recommendations: This section provides some recommendations for administrative actions that address the gaps in information as described in Section 4.

Section 6, Next Steps: This section briefly describes the proposed steps to be taken as a second phase of the pilot project.

Appendices: The appendices include the Information Centric View Models for the two counties, minutes from the interviews, sample



documents used in the exchange of data, and data on MANS requests and fingerprint card submissions.

## 1.2 SUMMARY

Interviews of local criminal justice agencies were conducted in Lewis & Clark County and Glacier County to obtain information on:

- ◆ Events that trigger the exchange of criminal history information (Arrest/Fingerprint Data; Charges; Dispositions)
- ◆ Agencies involved in the exchanges
- ◆ Nature and content of the information exchanged
- ◆ Business practices governing the exchange the information

The interview findings are displayed in the two Information Centric View Tables in Appendices B and D. In addition, Section 4 of this document contains narrative descriptions of the processes used by the various agencies to create and transfer data. The key findings resulting from the interviews in both counties are:

1. The MANS sheet and fingerprint cards, while not the only documents exchanged between local criminal justice agencies, are nevertheless integral parts of the exchange process. The officials interviewed in both counties were very familiar with the MANS sheet and understood the importance of sending the data to the CJIS central repository.
2. Key records management officials in both counties are making serious efforts to comply with the state's requirements for submissions to the central repository. They expressed a willingness to participate in this analysis in order to improve reporting processes and to make changes to enhance accuracy and timeliness.
3. Local records management systems are not integrated with the process of compiling the criminal history information for the state, nor do these systems support the exchange of this information among local agencies. Although Lewis & Clark County and the City of Helena have joined to begin implementation of a new public safety and records management system, this effort is not yet integrated with court automation efforts. Agencies in Glacier County and Cut Bank have older systems that are entirely stand-alone. The County Attorneys currently have no automated systems.



4. As a result of the lack of system integration at both the local and state levels, the exchange of critical criminal history information occurs entirely in paper form. The only exception to this is the pilot project now underway at the District Court in Lewis & Clark County for the input of disposition data directly into the central repository.
5. Business practices, as opposed to formal business rules, are used to move the MANS sheet and fingerprint cards from one agency to another. Informal procedures have been developed through the years that incorporate both the instructions from the CJIS Bureau and the particular working relationships between local law enforcement, prosecutors, and the courts. Because of the high level of cooperation among the agencies in these two counties, these informal processes appear to be fairly successful in moving routine information to the appropriate parties.
6. The most significant gaps in the flow of information are caused by:
  - ◆ Use of outdated instructions from the CJIS Bureau for the processing of MANS numbers, MANS sheets, and fingerprint cards. An example would be requesting MANS numbers for out-of-jurisdiction arrests using the booking agency's ORI.
  - ◆ Lack of understanding on the part of the arresting officer or booking staff about the offenses that are reportable to the CJIS central repository; this is particularly true of less common types of arrests, such as those for Contempt of Court and No Bond warrants.
  - ◆ Lack of prosecutor input in the MANS sheet. The County Attorneys do not use the forms and are not very familiar with them; they rely on the courts to handle the MANS sheet, but the courts do not fill in the prosecutor charges portion.
  - ◆ Lack of reliable methods to identify individuals that have not been booked prior to court action.
  - ◆ Lack of reliable methods to report changes to dispositions, such as appeals, deferrals, and post-conviction relief. There is no mechanism in place to trigger the exchange of this information with the CJIS central repository at the same time it is entered into court records.
  - ◆ Misunderstandings of processing by other agencies; in other words, one agency's staff may think they know what



is going on in another agency, but the two agencies are looking at the same information from different perspectives.

7. Time requirements for reporting data to the state are not incorporated into local processing practices; however, the courts that were interviewed are mailing reports to the CJIS central repository on a daily or weekly basis.

These findings from the local agency interviews confirm many of the issues identified by CJIS Bureau staff. The two counties involved in this analysis are considered to be among the most accurate reporting jurisdictions, and this is probably due the close working relationships forged among the various local agencies. These relationships allow for corrections to mistakes or oversights that occur in what is essentially a paper-based reporting system. It should be noted, however, that a higher level of accuracy does not necessarily mean that there are fewer reporting problems; for example, both counties have lower MANS/fingerprint submission rates than the state average.



## 2 PROJECT METHODOLOGY

The Analysis was conducted in accordance with the Project Work Plan approved by the MTDOJ. No significant changes were made to the Project Work Plan during this analysis. The only notable change was the deletion of the interview at the Supreme Court Administrator's Office which occurred because the Court's staff was unavailable during the interview period.

The approach used for the analysis involved the following steps:

- ◆ MTDOJ contacted the agencies to be interviewed and scheduled interview dates.
- ◆ An interview format consisting of key topic areas to be covered was prepared and approved by MTDOJ. The following data sets formed the basis of the examination of information flows:
  - Arrest/Fingerprint Data
  - Charges
  - Dispositions
- ◆ Interviews were conducted at the state level (MTDOJ CJIS Bureau and Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Bureau) and at the local level (Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena and Glacier County/City of Cut Bank). These interviews focused on:
  - Movement of arrest, charge, and disposition data
  - Actions that can result in disposition data that may or may not have been preceded by the normal processes of arrest or charge segments; and
  - Arrest and/or charge actions that may not have corresponding disposition data.

At the request of the MTDOJ, this analysis incorporates an approach to displaying information as described by SEARCH in the report entitled *Planning the Integration of Justice Information Systems: Developing Justice Information Exchange Points* (SEARCH, March 2000). The particular approach suggested by SEARCH that has been used in this document – the Information Centric View Table – was not fully developed in the SEARCH report. However, the concept has been incorporated in this analysis in order to summarize the processes that create data sets for criminal history records. The “views” tables identify each data set and capture the events that trigger the exchange of information, the agencies involved in the exchange, the conditions under which the exchange occurs, the format of the exchange, and subsequent events. (Please see Section 5 on Administrative Recommendations for an update of the SEARCH project.)





The short timeframe available to complete the project was identified at the outset of this Analysis as a limitation in the comprehensiveness of the Analysis. Interview questions were developed to try to elicit as much information as possible in the time available. There was insufficient time available for a detailed analysis of data elements within data sets; however, information was obtained during the interviews on data elements used to link the different data sets.

The Analysis was aided considerably by the extraordinary willingness of the individuals interviewed to provide information openly and frankly, even when the information brought out discrepancies in agency procedures. This cooperation made it considerably easier to identify gaps in information flow and significantly enhanced the overall value of this Analysis.

It is equally important to note that the findings and view tables reflect the information provided during the interviews and are therefore limited in scope by that information. The view tables are not intended to portray a complete picture of all events occurring at the agencies during the criminal history cycle, but they do represent key events that have an impact on the data compiled at the state's central repository. In addition, omissions may result if information on other events and steps were not provided during the interviews. Nevertheless, the findings provide significant insights into the procedures and business rules affecting criminal history data and how local agencies view these processes.

Consideration was given to designating the MANS number (the unique identifier assigned by MTDOJ for each arrest event) as a separate data set. As the interviews were conducted it became clear that the MANS number was an inherent part of the arrest event but also an element contained in subsequent events in the criminal history cycle. This is probably due to the local focus of activities described in the interviews; in other words, local agencies have incorporated the MANS number into their procedures to assist the central repository, but it is not the primary focus of their procedures for processing criminal cases.



### 3 ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

State officials have identified several issues concerning the flow of criminal history information. These issues were discussed during interviews with the MTDOJ staff and Department of Corrections (DOC) staff in the Probation and Parole Bureau and are summarized below.

#### 3.1 MANS NUMBERS

High-level issues related to MANS numbers are:

- ◆ Records are still being submitted to the central repository for events that have not been assigned a MANS number at the beginning of the criminal history cycle.
- ◆ Audits conducted by the CJIS Bureau indicate that there are continuing problems with MANS numbers without subsequent information in the criminal history cycle.
- ◆ Attempts to link records containing MANS numbers with records residing in the Supreme Court's JCMS central database have yielded poor results.

#### 3.2 ARREST AND FINGERPRINT DATA

High-level issues identified with the receipt of arrest and fingerprint data at the central repository are:

- ◆ Fingerprint cards for non-serious offenses continue to be submitted by law enforcement and booking agencies.
- ◆ Fingerprint cards for federal holds or arrests, which are not maintained in the central repository, are still being forwarded to the state for retention. However, this problem is not as prevalent as it has been in the past.
- ◆ Some fingerprint cards are submitted without associated MANS numbers.
- ◆ Probation and Parole jail sanctions are submitted even though these events are not maintainable.
- ◆ Fingerprint cards are sent in for identification purposes only, but are not marked correctly.

The full utility of the MANS number beyond that of a unique identifier may not have been realized because the number is not “pushed out” to agencies at the time the record is established in order to alert these agencies to a new arrest event. Other agencies that may be interested in



the establishment of a new arrest record include the County Attorney and the Probation and Parole Bureau.

Based on observations during audit and training sessions, the CJIS staff believe that high turnover rates of jail personnel results in some of the mistakes involving MANS numbers. Staff also believes this problem has become worse with the advent of new regional jails that serve a number of different jurisdictions. The turnover rate makes it difficult to address the problem with training since state trainers would not be able to keep up with the changes in staffing.

CJIS staff also provided additional detail on specific issues involving arrest and fingerprint data:

- ◆ MANS and ORI Mismatches: In cases where different jurisdictions use the same jail booking facility, incorrect ORIs may be applied to an arrest. In addition, in those District Courts that represent more than one county, the prosecuting jurisdiction is not identified and only the court's ORI is used.
- ◆ Probation and Parole Violations: In some cases, fingerprint cards are received for a probation or parole violation and the original offense is listed. This duplication gives the appearance that another arrest has occurred for the same charges. The error is discovered only when a record check is made on the individual and CJIS staff is reviewing the rap sheet, or when an audit is conducted on delinquent dispositions. In addition, the court docket number or other identifiers needed to link the probation and parole violation to the original case may be missing.
- ◆ Probation and Parole Jail Sanction Arrests: Fingerprint cards are received on jail sanction arrests, which are not maintainable events. Only the revocation of probation or parole should be maintained in the criminal history record. It is believed that specific convictions for Title 46 violations related to probation or parole may also be maintainable.
- ◆ Contempt of Court: The submission of contempt of court arrests related to civil cases, which are not maintained at the CJIS central repository, is a statewide problem. This may occur because the arrest or booking agency does not know if the warrant is for a criminal or civil case.
- ◆ Identification-Only Submissions: Fingerprint cards that are submitted only for identification purposes are not marked correctly.
- ◆ MCA and Literal Mismatch: The statutory code and the literal description of the offense may not be consistent.
- ◆ Missing Data Element: A data element commonly missed on the fingerprint card is the country of residence.



- ◆ Additional Charges: The CJIS Bureau has requested that submitting agencies obtain a new MANS number if additional charges are added after the initial record has been set up at the central repository. This is not done in all cases. However, this may be an area that the Bureau will want to revisit.
- ◆ Conspiracy and Attempt: The original charge for which conspiracy or attempt is being alleged is not always identified.
- ◆ Modifiers to the Charge: Modifications to a charge that enhance the severity of the charge are sometimes listed as separate charges.
- ◆ Prisoner transports: Some jurisdictions do not have the staff to transport prisoners, and this task is handled by the Highway Patrol. This can cause confusion about the appropriate ORI when the prisoner is brought to the booking site.

### 3.3 PROSECUTOR DATA

Prosecutor data is only included in a small portion of records received at the CJIS central repository, estimated at 1-10% of all records submitted. The MTDOJ staff identified prosecutor charges as the single largest gap in criminal history information.

When the prosecutor segment is unavailable in a criminal history record, it is not possible to track the charges through the entire criminal history cycle. As a result, many charges remain open on criminal history records because the central repository may not have disposition data when a prosecutor declines to file charges.

Other issues identified were:

- ◆ If a prosecutor amends a misdemeanor to a felony charge, this charge may not be forwarded to the central repository until the final disposition is forwarded by the court; this delay can cause a gap in the individual's record that may impact licensing and/or permit eligibility.
- ◆ Dispositions received from the multi-county District Courts do not always identify the jurisdiction in which the prosecution occurred.

### 3.4 COURT DATA

High-level issues related to the receipt of court data are:

- ◆ An audit of JCMS data and MANS numbers indicated that a high percentage of records cannot be linked electronically. (The JCMS system is the records management system used by District Courts; it



includes a central repository at the Supreme Court Administrator's Office.)

- ◆ It appears that most District Court offices are not using the sentencing conditions screens and that this information is not in the court's central repository.
- ◆ Records regarding deferred imposition of sentences and deferred prosecutions are missing or confusing.
- ◆ There is a lack of follow-up data on dismissals after deferrals. The "goldenrod" copy of the MANS sheet should be used to send these dispositions to the central repository.
- ◆ Various types of documents are sent in without MANS numbers, requiring research by CJIS Bureau staff to determine if there is a pre-existing record that can be linked with the new information. This includes court orders and judgements.
- ◆ Contempt of Court information on civil cases is submitted to the central repository when only criminal contempt records are maintainable. Some civil records are incorrectly shown as criminal contempt cases.
- ◆ Confusing or missing information is submitted on probation and parole violations.
- ◆ Free-form text on MANS sheets can be inconsistent with other data on the form; free-text descriptions for a disposition can differ from court to court or within a court.
- ◆ There is a lack of information on the movement of a case from one court to another.
- ◆ Cases split between justice and district court can result in the entire arrest cycle being closed when one of the courts has submitted a disposition but the other court case is still open. Additionally, if one court fails to submit the disposition on charges filed in that court, the arrest charges will continue to appear on the criminal history record.
- ◆ Post-conviction relief information is not forwarded to the central repository to update the court disposition.
- ◆ Specifications are still needed for the information that should be forwarded from the courts to the CJIS Bureau's central repository.

### 3.5 CORRECTIONS DATA

The major issue identified during interviews of DOC staff is that there is no set procedure or business rule at the department level for how arrests related to probation violations and jail sanctions are to be handled with respect to information due to the central repository. However, in both of the counties involved in this analysis, DOC Probation Offices were aware of the correct procedures to be used for these types of arrests.



Business rules for forwarding fingerprints to the CJIS central repository upon inmate intake are established at DOC. However, CJIS Bureau staff has identified a problem linking the corrections segment with a specific arrest and disposition. The staff believes this is due to inconsistency in the presentation of the court docket number, which is the key link between a disposition and inmate data. This number can be formatted differently in the Judgement, the MANS sheet, and JCMS, and the incorrect number may be entered into DOC's database.



## 4 INTERVIEW FINDINGS

### 4.1 FINDINGS AT THE STATE LEVEL

#### 4.1.1 CJIS Central Repository

Person records in the CJIS Bureau's central repository are established only when a fingerprint card has been received. Exceptions to this rule would occur when a record is researched after the receipt of a MANS sheet and a determination is made to establish a record. When both the fingerprint card and MANS sheets are mailed to the central repository (as opposed to situations where the booking agency uses live scan or card scan units), there are instances when the fingerprint card arrives at the same time as the completed MANS sheet.

The Bureau audits criminal history data submitted by local agencies and provides training for local staff involved in submitting fingerprints and criminal history information. Through both the auditing and training functions, the Bureau's staff has gained an understanding of the underlying problems that appear to cause gaps in data:

- ◆ Local law enforcement agencies hold a fingerprint card until a disposition is available. The reasons given for this delay usually involve lack of time and staff.
- ◆ Intra-agency conflicts at the local level interrupt the flow of information between those agencies and the flow of information to the state.
- ◆ Local agencies are not aware of the statutory requirements to submit arrest and disposition data within specified times.
- ◆ Some local agencies are not aware of the importance of the criminal history data to other jurisdictions and to the central repository.

Staff also believes that MANS numbers are frequently requested for non-reportable offenses or arrests because booking staff do not have sufficient time or training to determine whether a MANS number is needed. As a result, bookings routinely include a MANS number. This situation can result in incorrect submissions of fingerprint cards to the central repository. It can also result in MANS numbers without any associated fingerprint cards if the agency fails to inform the central repository that the MANS was requested in error.

Some agencies are not aware of the CJIN message M\*ANX which is to be used to cancel a MANS number request before the fingerprint card has been submitted (MANS numbers are not actually cancelled but the cycle can be ended so that no further data events are expected). However, if the



fingerprint card has already been submitted, this message cannot be used. The submitting agency must contact the CJIS Bureau directly to resolve the matter. The repository returns any cards that are non-maintainable.

Although staff from the Supreme Court Administrator's Office (SCAO) was not available for interviews with this project, the CJIS Bureau staff is familiar with court systems through their joint planning efforts with the SCAO. The Courts of Limited Jurisdiction (which include City and Justice Courts) are in the process of installing a records management system, JSI Full Court. The program has been installed in the City and Justice courts in the City of Helena and Lewis & Clark County. These local courts confirmed that the new system is intended eventually to have a central repository. The District Courts use the JCMS records management system, which was developed in-house by SCAO and which currently has a central repository.

One problem in past years, submissions to the CJIS Bureau's central repository for federal arrests, is no longer significant on a statewide basis. Training efforts at the booking agencies seem to have worked in this situation.

#### 4.1.2 Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Bureau

According to DOC staff, there two management information systems used for corrections data: Profiles, the newest department-wide system, which currently includes the descriptive information on offenders; and ACIS, the legacy system that contains the sentencing information and inmate movement data. The Judgement received from the court in paper form is used to enter an offender's information into Profiles.

To assist Probation Officers in their enforcement efforts, CJIN terminals have been installed in five DOC regions at six offices. There are a total of 25 probation offices located throughout the state.

According to DOC intake staff, inmates committed to Montana State Prisons or the Department of Corrections are fingerprinted for the following events: new sentences; revoked deferred sentences; revoked suspended sentences; and parole violations. If the facility taking the prints has a live scan unit, prints are submitted electronically to the CJIS Bureau. Those facilities that do not have live scan units send inked prints to the DOC Records Department, which forwards cards to the CJIS Bureau. According to Probation and Parole Bureau staff, offenders are not fingerprinted at the time of intake into pre-release facilities.





A new program to be implemented by DOC in the near future is the Felony DUI Facility. Individuals sentenced to this facility are considered to have inmate status; no decision has been made on the intake process to be used, including fingerprinting.

Parole revocations are not handled through the courts but are processed through the Board of Pardons and Parole. Probation and Parole Bureau staff at the state administrative level is not familiar with the current processes used at the local level for fingerprinting in the cases of probation and parole violations; however, they were aware of previous agreements with MTDOJ on procedures to be used for these cases. CJIS Bureau staff confirmed that earlier instructions were to fingerprint all bookings involving probation and parole cases.

## 4.2 CRIMINAL HISTORY CYCLE AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

The data sets and triggering events for the exchange of information are identified in the Information Centric View tables included in Appendix B and Appendix D. The procedures used by these local criminal justice agencies to establish and transfer criminal history data are also described in detail in the minutes of interviews with officials from the two counties (see Appendix C and E). The following sections summarize the interview findings and describe gaps and inconsistencies in the flow of data.

### 4.2.1 Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena

The Lewis & Clark County Sheriff's Office and the City of Helena Police Department share administrative headquarters in the joint Law Enforcement Facility; the County Jail is also located at that site. Dispatching and records management is performed by the Support Services Division (SSD), a joint operation between the two jurisdictions that is run by the Helena Police Department. The SSD Records Division is the central repository for all law enforcement reports and records. For arrest and booking activities, the same procedures are used by both jurisdictions.

Jail staff use a live scan unit for fingerprinting and the data are sent electronically to the CJIS Bureau. After bookings, SSD disperses arrest records (MANS sheets) and Notices to Appear (NTA) to the appropriate court each day; this can be done by delivery to the court or by placing the documents in a mail slot located in the Law Enforcement Facility.

The City Court reviews violations to determine if they meet the statutory requirements for criminal history records maintained at the state's central repository; if so, the dispositions are sent to the state. In Lewis & Clark County, all misdemeanor and felony cases prosecuted by the County



Attorney begin in Justice Court. Misdemeanor cases will remain in Justice Court; felony cases, or cases involving both felonies and misdemeanors, are moved to District Court following the Initial Appearance.

Each court is responsible for maintaining its own records and forwarding disposition information to the state. The courts do not share records management systems and all records are transferred from court to court in paper form. The County Attorney's office also exchanges documents in paper form with the appropriate court.

The county and city are currently in the process of working with a software company (LogiSys) to implement a public safety/records management system in both jurisdictions.

#### 4.2.2 Glacier County/City of Cut Bank

The Justice and City Courts use the same judge, who holds court on Tuesday and Wednesday afternoons. The position of City Court Clerk is vacant at this time. The District Court judge is assigned to four counties and holds court in Glacier County every two weeks on the first and third Wednesdays of the month. Glacier County has the largest District Court caseload of all four counties.

Misdemeanor cases are handled by Justice Court. Felony cases (or combined felony/misdemeanor cases) are sent directly to District Court without going to Justice Court first. The exceptions to this procedure are DUI cases when it is not clear from the outset that the DUI is the fourth such offense and therefore should be charged as a felony.

The County Attorney, who serves part time, receives notification of an arrest through receipt of a police or sheriff's case report. The County Attorney uses the case report to prepare a Motion for Leave to File Information with the appropriate court. After reviewing this Motion, the court can issue an order to grant leave to file the Information. After the court's order on the Motion, the County Attorney takes his file on the case (which includes the original law enforcement case report, the Motion, and the Information) to the appropriate court clerk. The court staff pulls out the documents needed for the court docket file, makes copies, and places the copies in the County Attorney's file. The file is then returned to the County Attorney.

Justice Court has not installed the new Full Court software for the Courts of Limited Jurisdiction and is still using the SCAO's LJCMS program. The District Court is using JCMS. The Police Department has installed



the IMC records management software provided by the Board of Crime Control, and the Sheriff's Office is using Swift software.

## 4.3 PROCESSING OF THE MANS NUMBER

### 4.3.1 Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena

#### 4.3.1.1 Arrest/Booking

The SSD dispatchers obtain MANS numbers and prepare MANS sheets for arrests or bookings resulting from NTAs and court orders. A pilot project between the jail and the CJIS Bureau is currently underway to allow booking staff, rather than dispatchers, to obtain the MANS number using a CJIN terminal.

MANS sheets are forwarded from the jail booking unit to SSD, which disperses the MANS sheets to the appropriate court. If the individual arrested is still in custody, the MANS sheet will accompany the person to the Initial Appearance in Justice Court.

SSD staff do not obtain MANS numbers or prepare MANS sheets for the following booking events: non-serious offenses; probation/parole violations and jail sanctions; intra-jurisdictional writs for custody; federal arrests; civil contempt of court (if the arrest warrant is clearly marked as a civil case). MANS numbers may be used for arrests related to Restitution Orders and No Bond Arrests. No changes are made to the charges on the MANS sheet after the fingerprints have been forwarded electronically to the state because SSD recognizes that the arrest charges have already been received at the state repository.

If an individual appears in court as a result of a NTA, or if the person has not been fingerprinted for whatever reason, all three courts will use an "Appearance" form to order that the person be booked (usually booked and released). At the time of these bookings, the jail staff will obtain a MANS number and prepare a MANS sheet, which is returned to the appropriate court to be maintained in the court docket file.

MANS numbers are obtained when court action occurs on probation violations and the court has ordered that the offender be booked accordingly. The court docket number, which is included on the court documentation sent over to the jail, is used to tie the original charges to the latest booking event. The local Probation and Parole Officer interviewed confirmed that MANS sheets are no longer prepared by his office and that MANS numbers are not obtained for the initial booking on the violation.



In summarizing the approach used for compiling criminal history data for eventual transfer to the state, the SSD staff said that the general rule used for fingerprinting and obtaining MANS numbers is that MANS numbers are only obtained when fingerprints are taken. However, MANS numbers are not requested for all booking events or when fingerprinting is done for identification purposes only.

#### 4.3.1.2 Prosecutor Charges

The County Attorney's Office does not handle MANS sheets and the prosecutor charges portion on the sheet is not filled out. MANS sheets prepared by the booking unit are forwarded to either Justice or City Courts. The Justice Court staff makes a notation on the MANS sheet that a case has been filed but does not add charge information.

If the County Attorney declines to file charges, the dismissal of charges occurs during the Initial Appearance in Justice Court. The court completes the disposition portion of the MANS sheet and sends it to the CJIS Bureau.

Docket numbers for cases to be prosecuted in District Court are obtained by the County Attorney from the Court Clerk. The format of the docket number, which is placed on documents prepared by the County Attorney's office for each case, reflects which judge is assigned to the case. The resulting format is: ADC(Judge A in District Court)-year-number.

#### 4.3.1.3 Court Action

In all three courts (City, Justice, and District), MANS sheets are maintained in court docket files until there is a disposition to the case or the case is moved to another court. For example, if the case is moved from Justice to District court, the Justice Court sends the MANS sheet to the County Attorney, who then files the case in District Court. (Issues related to the County Attorney's handling of the MANS sheet are discussed in Section 4.4.1, below.)

When a case is disposed in City Court, the court staff records the disposition on the MANS sheet and mails it to the CJIS central repository. Mailings are done once a week.

Dispositions in Justice Court are recorded on the MANS sheet and mailed to the CJIS central repository. If the disposition involves a plea agreement in Justice Court, this is noted on the MANS sheet.



If a misdemeanor case is appealed from Justice Court to District Court, the entire file including the MANS sheet is sent to District Court. No disposition is sent to the CJIS central repository since the case is still considered open.

If a case is split between Justice Court and District court (which these courts indicated is not a common occurrence in Lewis & Clark County), the Justice Court fills out the MANS sheet to reflect the misdemeanor disposition and transfers the sheet to the District Court. Under this situation, it would be possible to have a misdemeanor conviction that is not reported to the central repository until a disposition is reached in District Court and the MANS sheet is finally forwarded on to the state. If the misdemeanor is dismissed by the County Attorney, the MANS sheet will be transferred from Justice Court to the County Attorney.

The District Court uses the identifying information (name, social security number, date of birth, and MANS number) from the MANS sheet to enter the data into JCMS. The District Court has implemented a process to verify that all docket numbers have MANS numbers. If the MANS number and associated MANS sheet are missing, the clerk informs the judge that the offender should be sent to booking for fingerprinting.

The District Court staff enters judgement information on the MANS sheet, attaches a copy of the judgement (pursuant to a recent audit process the CJIS Bureau intended to compare MANS data with JCMS data), and mails the sheet to the CJIS central repository. Mailings are done when the MANS sheet has been completed.

If charges are amended by District Court action, this information is entered into JCMS but not on the MANS sheet. Plea agreements are also not recorded as agreements on the MANS sheet.

Changes in dispositions of deferred cases are recorded on the goldenrod copy of the MANS sheet and mailed to the CJIS central repository. Post-conviction relief actions that change a disposition are recorded on the goldenrod copy of the MANS sheet and forwarded to the state.

The recent installation in this District Court of CJIN court screens via CyberLynxx has changed the court's procedures for handling MANS sheets. The court can now enter disposition data on the court screens for direct input to the state's criminal history database in place of completing the MANS sheet. Several procedural details still remain to be ironed out, such as whether the judgement should still be mailed to the CJIS Bureau and how changes to judgements (such as post-conviction relief and appeals) will be handled in the electronic transmission. However, the



initial reports on the use of the CyberLynxx court screens has been very positive.

#### 4.3.2 Glacier County/City of Cut Bank

##### 4.3.2.1 Arrest/Booking

Cut Bank Police Officers and Glacier County Sheriff's Deputies obtain MANS numbers from the Sheriff's Office dispatch. The officers do their own fingerprinting and prepare the MANS sheet. Police Officers perform these tasks at the Police Department facility and, if jail custody is required, escort the offender to the County Jail.

The Police Department sends the MANS sheet to the City Court Clerk, whose office is located in the same building as the PD. The MANS sheets may also be sent to the Sheriff's Office, perhaps at booking, but the Sheriff's Office indicated that they do not always receive them. If the City Clerk is handling the MANS sheet, the clerk mails the document to the Justice Court Clerk. Since the City Clerk position is vacant, some of these procedures may change when the position has been filled.

The Sheriff's Deputies send MANS sheets and fingerprints to the department's Terminal Agency Coordinator (TAC). The TAC then sends the MANS sheets to the Justice Court for misdemeanor cases and to District Court for felony cases. The sheets are forwarded directly to the court and do not accompany the defendants to the initial appearance. Fingerprint cards are mailed to the CJIS Bureau usually on a weekly basis; the agency does not have a live scan or card scan unit.

These law enforcement representatives, including the local Probation Officer, are aware that fingerprints and MANS numbers are not needed for probation violations until court action occurs. They are also aware that civil cases involving contempt of court are not reportable to the state.

If an arrest is made by a federal law enforcement agency (such as Customs, INS, and the BIA) for a federal violation, and the individual is brought to the Glacier County jail to be held, the Sheriff's Office ORI is used for the fingerprints. The Sheriff's Office obtains a MANS number but does not fill out a MANS sheet for these federal arrests; staff indicated that this procedure is being used pursuant to the ID Bureau's instructions.

If the arrest is made by a federal agency for a state violation, that agency writes up a report for the Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office sends a deputy to pick up the individual, who is booked under the Sheriff's ORI. The County Attorney prosecutes the case.



If the Highway Patrol makes an arrest, the individual is booked using the Highway Patrol's ORI. The case is filed in District Court and prosecuted by the County Attorney.

Individuals may not have been fingerprinted if they have received a Notice to Appear (NTA) and a physical arrest or booking has not occurred. If a Notice to Appear is issued for City Court, the Police Department will usually fingerprint the defendant for their records but the department does not request a MANS number or prepare a MANS sheet. In District Court, if the court file does not include a MANS sheet, the Court Clerk will include a notice in the file that goes to the judge. This notice, which is printed on lime-colored paper, indicates that the individual should be fingerprinted at the Sheriff's Office after the court appearance.

#### 4.3.2.2 Prosecutor Charges

The County Attorney does not receive the MANS sheet at any point in the process. The prosecutor portion of the MANS sheet is not completed.

#### 4.3.2.3 Court Action

The courts receive MANS sheets from the law enforcement agencies after an arrest or after an order by the court for an individual to be booked. When a case has been disposed by the court, both Justice and District Courts complete the MANS sheet and send them in by mail to the CJIS central repository. District Court mailings are done at the time the sheet is completed; Justice Court mails once a week.

The County Attorney prepares the judgements for the courts using Word. The courts no longer send a copy of the judgement along with the MANS sheet to the central repository.

According to the District Court, the MANS sheet is sent at the time of the initial court action on a deferred imposition. On the dismissal date for the deferral, the Court notifies the County Attorney and/or the Court-appointed counsel that no petition regarding the deferral has been filed. When the court takes action on the petition, the Clerk sends in the goldenrod copy of the MANS sheet to indicate the Court's action.

In the situation when a case is appealed from Justice Court to District Court, the Justice Court has already sent in the MANS sheet with the original Justice Court decision. According to the District Court, when the District Court decision has been rendered, the judgement is entered into court records and the file is closed. No further reporting to the CJIS central repository occurs.





When a District Court case is appealed to the Supreme Court, the District Court reports to the CJIS central repository only when the original judgement changes. This is reported using the goldenrod copy of the MANS sheet.

## 4.4 IDENTIFICATION OF GAPS AND INCONSISTENCIES

The interview findings at the local level confirm many of the issues identified by CJIS Bureau staff. They also provide some clues as to why these gaps are occurring.

### 4.4.1 Lewis & Clark County/City of Helena

Some of the arrest warrants for contempt of court are not clearly marked as involving a civil or criminal case. This can cause confusion at the time of booking because it is not possible to know whether a MANS number should be requested. To assist in the warrant process, the City Court takes the extra steps to place the statutory reference on the warrant and to mark all criminal warrants as “Criminal.”

It is not clear whether MANS numbers are obtained for Restitution Orders and No Bond Arrests. There are no definitive procedures in place for these situations.

According to staff in the County Attorney’s office, the staff never sees the MANS sheet. However, the Justice Court believes that the MANS sheet is forwarded to the County Attorney’s office when a case is moved from Justice Court to District Court. The District Court also believes that the MANS sheet is transferred from the County Attorney. The County Attorney’s office confirmed that the entire court case file is moved from Justice to District Court, it may be possible that the County Attorney receives the MANS sheet as part of the larger case file during the transfer of that file from one court to the other.

There are no set procedures or guidelines for how the MANS sheet should be handled when a case is split between Justice and District Court. It is possible to have a misdemeanor conviction that is not reported to the central repository until a disposition is rendered in District Court and the MANS information is finally forwarded on to the state.

It is also not clear to local agencies whether Title 46 violations for which there is a conviction (as opposed to revocation of probation) are treated, and whether new MANS numbers are issued.





The courts indicated that they actively look for incidents where booking has not occurred. For example, District court has instituted a check between docket numbers and MANS numbers to insure that each case has a MANS number. However, there does not appear to be a reliable and easy way to determine if booking is needed as a case moves through the charging and adjudication process.

District Court staff are not certain about the processing of the MANS sheet in cases that have been appealed from Justice Court to District Court. It may be that the MANS sheet is included in the case file when the case is remanded back to Justice Court. For District Court decisions that are appealed to the Supreme Court, no notification is forwarded to the CJIS central repository that the appeal has been filed. If a case is remanded back to the District Court for a new trial, this information is also not forwarded to the repository.

The District Court is in the process of imaging court files. The court has recognized that this may cause an unintended problem because the goldenrod copy of the MANS sheet will no longer be immediately available to send to the CJIS central repository if changes occur to the disposition. The physical presence of the goldenrod copy has served as a reminder to inform the state of a change in the disposition.

Sentencing conditions are not entered into JCMS and are only contained in the paper copy of the judgement. There is no provision for the entry of conditions on the MANS sheet unless the information is included with the charge dispositions. Interviewees commented that conditions are almost always the same for all judgements regardless of the type of case involved.

#### 4.4.2 [Glacier County/City of Cut Bank](#)

According to the Glacier County/City of Cut Bank representatives, a couple of weeks may pass before the courts receive the MANS sheets from law enforcement. The District Court clerk indicated that the Information filed by the County Attorney may be received before the MANS sheet. Since the Information does not identify the arresting agency, the clerk looks at the list of witnesses to determine which jurisdiction was the arresting agency.

As stated above, the Sheriff's Office obtains a MANS number for federal arrests involving federal violations but does not send the fingerprints to the state and no MANS sheet is prepared. This causes a gap in information at the CJIS central repository because there is a MANS number with no corresponding fingerprint data. The Sheriff's Office may also be using their own ORI for arrests from other jurisdictions other than the federal government, such as other counties. According to CJIS Bureau



staff, a significant number of MANS number requests by Glacier County were found in an audit to have no subsequent fingerprint submissions; from May 1-September 30, 2001, 119 MANS numbers were assigned but only 58 felony and misdemeanor fingerprint segments were received. Many of these missing arrest segments may be caused by federal and other jurisdiction bookings for which MANS numbers are obtained incorrectly.

Individuals may also appear in court (Justice or District) without having been fingerprinted first through an informal arrangement between the County Attorney and the defendant's attorney. The court staffs attempt to identify these types of incidents so that the judge can order that the individual report to booking. However, the court does not always have a deputy in the courtroom to escort the defendant to booking; as a result, the staff believe that there are occasions when the defendant simply does not go to booking to get fingerprinted.

Cases involving both felonies and misdemeanors are usually combined and prosecuted in District Court. If the case is split between the two courts, there is confusion about how the MANS sheet should be handled.

Because the District Court Clerk's office understands the importance of sending disposition information to the CJIS central repository, her office will take action to try to obtain missing MANS sheets from the appropriate law enforcement agency. However, if a MANS sheet with the accompanying MANS number cannot be obtained, the Clerk does not send disposition information on the case to the CJIS central repository.

Based on the information provided during the interviews, cases appealed from Justice Court to District Court do not appear to be reported to the CJIS central repository. The Justice Court sends the MANS sheet with the original Justice Court decision, and the District Court does not report to the state if the judgement changes as a result of the District Court action.

## **4.5 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

### **4.5.1 Intra-Agency Interaction**

The process of exchanging information in the two counties involved in this analysis benefits greatly from their commitment to intra-agency cooperation. In both jurisdictions, a close working relationship allows the various parties to fill any gaps in information through informal channels. In Lewis & Clark County, for example, there is a shared understanding of the various procedures used by different agencies, and although this understanding may not be accurate in all cases, there is an underlying commitment to coordinate activities. Based on the observations of CJIS



Bureau audit and training staff, the importance of this kind of cooperation among local agencies cannot be understated.

In Glacier County is the smaller of the two counties interviewed in terms of population, and it has a relatively low caseload. For example, District Court handles 70-77 cases per year. In addition, there is a close professional relationship among the various agencies in the county. Problems caused by gaps in information or communication can easily be resolved with a phone call. This close working relationship among the various agencies helps move cases through the criminal justice system. Changes and adjustments in normal procedures for the purpose of handling a specific case can be handled through informal agreements. There is also significant name familiarity in the county; many of the cases are linked not by numeric identifiers but by the name of the defendant which is known to all agencies involved in the case.

Despite good working relationships, the various agencies involved think they have a good understanding of what other agencies are doing with commonly shared data, but this understanding can sometimes be incorrect or outdated. In addition, it is also not uncommon for agencies to use slightly different terms for data or events, causing confusion and increasing the potential for gaps in processing. This appears to be the case at both the local and state levels.

CJIS Bureau staff handling audit and training functions have a good understanding of the basic processes used at the local level. Training and retraining efforts can have a positive effect on local agencies; as an example, local representatives in Lewis & Clark County were well aware of the change in instructions for fingerprinting federal arrests. Information gleaned from the interviews indicates that procedures used at the local level reflect outdated instructions from earlier training sessions. Unfortunately, the amount of time available for CJIS Bureau staff to work one-on-one with local agencies is limited.

#### 4.5.2 Data Submissions and Data Links

Representatives from the local agencies that participated in this analysis understood the importance of complete and accurate criminal history records. However, according to the CJIS Bureau, the capability and willingness to submit required data to the central repository varies statewide. This could be a result of staffing limitations (understaffing, poor training, or high turnover) at the local level, but it could also be caused by a misunderstanding of the state's requirements and needs. For example, the CJIS Bureau staff identified a problem with submissions in cases involving prisoner transportation and booking, but the local agencies



interviewed believed that they were handling these cases in the manner required by the state.

The courts have increasingly taken on the task of linking MANS numbers with court docket numbers. The District Court in Lewis & Clark County actively compares the two numbers to ensure that all case files have a MANS sheet. The District Court in Glacier County tries to close out all cases with the completion of the MANS sheet; if the document cannot be obtained, no submission is made to the central repository. In both situations, these are manual checks.

The data needed by the CJIS central repository is a small subset of data maintained by local criminal justice agencies. The critical links between the arrest and the disposition are the MANS number and the court docket number. The SCAO's two records management systems, JCMS and Full Court, include the MANS number as an identifier and the MANS sheet includes a block for the docket number. However, other documents that are frequently received by the CJIS bureau do not always include these links. Examples include court documents received prior to or without MANS sheets; court documents slightly different docket number formats; and court documents from cases that have been transferred from one court to another. In these cases, linkage requires research by CJIS Bureau staff.

Unlike the Courts, there is no link with the prosecutor data because that portion of the criminal history cycle is rarely reported to the state. The only way the central repository receives prosecutor data including charges is when it is included on the MANS sheet and is finally submitted to the repository after the court has completed the disposition portion.

#### 4.5.3 Data Systems and Data Transfer

The type of automated systems and system functionality varies significantly from agency to agency. Some agencies have older systems that have outlived their usefulness but there is no funding for replacement. Others are in the process of implementing new systems that may or may not be easily integrated with state systems. The court systems are state-mandated and are not integrated with local systems. There is no statewide system for prosecutors and there are currently no plans for such a system or for data sharing among prosecuting agencies.

Because of the lack of integrated or electronic systems, the exchange of critical criminal history information occurs entirely in paper form. The physical presence of the MANS sheet is a crucial part of the exchange process. For example, if the MANS sheet is contained in a court docket file, it is processed and submitted or transferred to another court; conversely, if it is missing, a search begins to find out why. The



appearance of the MANS sheet is also part of the exchange: it is frequently called the “green sheet” and the content of the form is known by that color; the presence of the “goldenrod” copy of the MANS sheet is a reminder to send in changes to dispositions.

#### 4.5.4 Business Rules Versus Informal Procedures

Based on observations during this Analysis, the business practices governing the creation and transfer of data at the local level appear to be guided not by established business rules but by more informal, generally accepted procedures that have been developed through the years. These procedures incorporate instructions from the CJIS Bureau and take advantage of the particular working relationships developed between local law enforcement, prosecutors, and the courts. Time requirements for submissions to the state are not formally incorporated into these procedures, although the courts mail dispositions on a weekly basis or less and are therefore within the statutory requirement. There do not appear to be any time requirements for the exchange of data between agencies at the local level.

Specific business rules do not exist at the state level in the Department of Corrections for processing criminal history data related to probation violation cases. However, both of the Probation Officers interviewed for this analysis were aware of the correct handling of MANS sheets for these cases. This understanding results from working closely with local criminal justice agencies.



## 5 ADMINISTRATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

This section contains recommendations for administrative actions that could be taken regardless of any longer-term legislative or technical solutions. In some cases, these actions may already be in the planning stages, and these recommendations can be considered for incorporation in those plans.

### 5.1 MONITORING LOCAL ACTIVITIES

Two ongoing events in Lewis & Clark County may change current data exchange procedures and may result in closing some of the information gaps identified in this Analysis. First, the CJIN access recently installed at the District Court will provide disposition data more rapidly and in an accurate form through the use of the M\*ECourt Screens. This effort replaces manual completion of the MANS sheet followed by mailing the form with data input and electronic submission; it still requires double entry of disposition data in both the JCMS system and the CJIN screens. This pilot project should be monitored carefully to determine the impact of using this input method on both court procedures and on the compilation of criminal history data.

Second, SSD is in the processing of streamlining procedures used in the Division; this provides an opportunity to take advantage of improvements or corrections to procedures used to create and transfer criminal history data. The CJIS Bureau could assist in their review of procedures by streamlining and clarifying state requirements for MANS numbers and MANS sheets.

The CJIS Bureau has audit tools that can be used to identify problems in specific locations by combining site-specific audit findings with activity summaries. These efforts can have a very positive impact at the local level if local agencies are able to make appropriate procedural changes. For example, summary reports from the criminal history and AFIS systems are combined with site audits to compare data on MANS numbers requested, fingerprints submitted, non-serious offenses returned, and live scan errors. The resulting analysis can disclose typical errors so that training can be customized for specific agencies.

An analysis of reports from the Criminal History Records System can provide additional information for targeting bureau activities according to the impact on the bureau's workload. For example, a review of data from January 2001 through November 18, 2001 on MANS numbers requested



and fingerprint cards submitted provides the following picture of statewide activity:

- ◆ 15 jurisdictions account for a total of 64% of the total number of MANS numbers requested.
- ◆ These same 15 jurisdictions had 480 or more requests in the 11.5-month period examined (approximately 42 per month).
- ◆ 167 jurisdictions have submitted at least one MANS request; 113 have submitted 10 or more; 90 jurisdictions have submitted 25 or more.
- ◆ The percentage of MANS numbers compared to fingerprint submissions on a statewide basis is 72%.

Summaries of data from the MTDOJ CHRS are included in Appendix G of this document.

The Bureau may also want to make live scan transmission quality reports more available to a wider group of local agencies since these reports have been used by some agencies to evaluate quality and operation issues. Any other reports that have been requested by local agencies should be reviewed and considered for their possible utility to local agencies.

## 5.2 STATE-LEVEL ACTIONS

Before additional efforts are made to clarify reporting requirements for local agencies, the CJIS Bureau may want to consider reviewing the legal basis for maintaining certain Title 45 and Title 46 offenses. There are relatively few statutes that need to be reviewed, and compiling an up-to-date list will resolve some of the reporting questions at both the state and local levels. The statutes identified during this analysis are listed below; they are all included in the current list of maintainable charges:

- ◆ 46-6-212 Failure to Appear Following Summons or NTA
- ◆ 46-6-503 Violation of Release Conditions – Forfeiture
- ◆ 46-9-505 Issuance of Arrest Warrant (literal definition of Bail/Bond revocation)
- ◆ 46-18-203 Revocation of Suspended or Deferred Sentence
- ◆ 46-23-1012 Probation Violation

In addition, staff was also not sure if Restitution Orders and No Bond Warrants should be retained in CHR.

There are additional administrative tasks that could have an immediate impact on the accuracy of data before longer-term solutions are





implemented; however, it would require a commitment of resources by the CJIS Bureau at a time when the staff time is very limited. These tasks are:

- ◆ Revise the Administrative Rules (dated 7/01/93) to reflect current law. An example of the outdated material included in these rules is the requirement that MANS numbers be issued for all custodial or felony arrests.
- ◆ Revise the Criminal History Record Program (CHRP) Manual to reflect current law and current practices; the last publication date was 7/01/93. This should include standards such as descriptions for charges (“literals”).
- ◆ Revise the MANS sheet to reflect current requirements and to highlight information that is often missing, and clarify when and how dispositions should be reported to the central repository when a case is being appealed.
- ◆ Review ORI assignments to determine if additional assignments should be made.
- ◆ Develop summary handouts (“tips”) for obtaining MANS numbers and completing MANS sheets; these handouts could be posted at booking areas and other central locations to assist local staff at the time of booking or when the MANS sheet is filled out.

The CJIS Bureau has correctly identified backlogs at the bureau level as detrimental to any efforts to improve the timely submission of data from the local level. The Bureau is making a substantial effort to avoid these backlogs, which can build up again as a result of staff sick or vacation leave. At this time, the NEC Transaction Controller (TC) is not capable of communicating directly with the criminal history system so that the CHR can screen out any non-maintainable submissions from live scan and card scan units. Until this functionality has been installed in the TC, there will not be any substantial relief to the ongoing effort to avoid backlogs.

Since the initial response to the use of CJIN screens at Lewis & Clark District Court was very positive, the Bureau should monitor this pilot project carefully. The M\*ECourt screens should be reviewed to determine if the current screens allow for the input of all required data and if the manner in which information should be input is obvious to the user. This review should include possible court actions such as post-conviction relief, appeals, and pardons. Additional consideration of this approach will be reviewed in Phase II of the Analysis.

To enhance the goals of integration, the state should consider developing specifications for the exchange of data related to criminal history. Some of the local agencies are moving forward with locally integrated systems,





and it would be desirable to incorporate these specifications into these new systems. Specifications become even more critical for purposes of exchanging information from and to the courts, because the records management systems implemented by SCAO are separately managed.

Since the interviews were conducted and the view models created for this report, new information has been obtained regarding the continued development of the SEARCH model for data exchange points. As the SEARCH project continues, the dimensions of data exchanges that are examined and the views used to illustrate exchange points have continued to evolve. For example, the view formerly referred to as the Information Centric View is now called the Data Set-Centric View. Although the SEARCH reports are still preliminary in nature, additional work has been done on creating standard or generic names for use in describing the various components of data exchange, and a new dimension has been added to describe the "state" or phase of a case in which an exchange may occur. As the SEARCH model becomes more refined, MTDOJ may wish to follow up on the work contained in this document with a more detailed analysis of data exchanges in Montana.



## 6 NEXT STEPS

Phase I of the Business Practices Analysis reviewed current issues and activities related to the flow of criminal justice information among local criminal justice agencies and the state's central repository. The findings from this first phase will be the basis for the identification and recommendation of possible technical solutions in Phase II.

Phase II will focus on the issues identified in the Business Practices Analysis and will present high-level solutions for improvements to the exchange of criminal history information. The development of associated cost estimates may be possible depending on the nature of these solutions. The solutions will be strategic in nature and are intended to be used as the basis for further research and analysis by the MTDOJ.

Pursuant to funding deadlines, the work for Phase II must be completed and approved no later than December 31, 2001.



## 7 APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW MINUTES WITH STATE AGENCIES



## 8 APPENDIX B: LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY/CITY OF HELENA VIEW TABLE

### Information Centric View Table, Lewis & Clark County MTDOJ Business Practices Analysis

The following information on data sets developed for criminal history records was derived from interviews conducted on October 23-Nov. 2, 2001, with criminal justice agencies in Lewis & Clark County and the City of Helena. Errors in the representation of this information may result from confusion caused by different terminology used in the various agencies and from the limited time available to identify all possible variations of triggering events.

This table is based on preliminary research contained in the SEARCH report entitled *Planning the Integration of Justice Information Systems: Developing Justice Information Exchange Points* (Search, March 2000). It does not reflect recent and ongoing modifications to the research model.

#### ***Notes:***

1. An asterisk denotes gaps in information flow or inconsistencies in internal procedures.
2. If no action is taken to create criminal history information for the CJIS Central Repository, the entry under the Receiving Agency and Subsequent Events columns will be labeled as "none."



## 9 APPENDIX C: LEWIS & CLARK COUNTY/CITY OF HELENA INTERVIEW MINUTES



## 10 APPENDIX D: GLACIER COUNTY/CITY OF CUT BANK VIEW TABLE

### Information Centric View Table, Glacier County MTDOJ Business Practices Analysis

The following information on data sets developed for criminal history records was derived from interviews conducted on October 29, with criminal justice agencies in Glacier County and the City of Cut Bank. Errors in the representation of this information may result from confusion caused by different terminology used in the various agencies and from the limited time available to identify all possible variations of triggering events.

Because the interviews were conducted with all the agencies at the same time, the process described is based on data set by event, not data set by agency, as was done in the Lewis & Clark County View. The limited time available for this interview resulted in less detailed information than the interviews conducted in Lewis & Clark County.

This table is based on preliminary research contained in the SEARCH report entitled *Planning the Integration of Justice Information Systems: Developing Justice Information Exchange Points* (Search, March 2000). It does not reflect recent and ongoing modifications to the research model.

#### ***Notes:***

1. An asterisk denotes gaps in information flow or inconsistencies in internal procedures.
2. If no action is taken to create criminal history information for the CJIS Central Repository, the entry under the Receiving Agency and Subsequent Events columns will be labeled as “none.”



## 11 APPENDIX E: GLACIER COUNTY/CITY OF CUT BANK INTERVIEW MINUTES



## 12 APPENDIX F: SAMPLE DOCUMENTS





## 13 APPENDIX G: CHRS SUMMARY DATA ON MANS NUMBER REQUESTS AND FINGERPRINT SUBMISSIONS